

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Helen Faye Gerald,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
City of Mullins Police Department,  
Defendant.

Civil Action No. 4:24-cv-5271-CMC

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff Helen Faye Gerald's ("Plaintiff") *pro se* Complaint. ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West for pre-trial proceedings.

On October 2, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") recommending this matter be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. ECF No. 12. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if she failed to do so. Plaintiff has failed to file objections and the time to do so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28

U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After a review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error. Plaintiff alleges only a South Carolina statute was violated, and thus does not invoke federal question jurisdiction. ECF No. 1-1 at 3. No diversity jurisdiction exists. Accordingly, the court adopts the Report by reference in this Order. This action is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina  
October 28, 2024